

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 8, 15 and 18 have been amended.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "plurality of image features."

Applicant thanks the examiner for his observation and has amended the claim as has been interpreted by the examiner.

Having amended claim 5 to include the term "plurality of object features," applicant submits the reason for the rejection has been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Basu (USP no. 6,219,640).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the reason for rejecting the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to more clearly state the invention.

More specifically, the claims have been amended to recite that the processor determines a maximum correlation value and that the correlation values are determined as the sum of the elements of a subset between the audio features and selected object features. No new matter has been added.

Support for the above amendment may be found at least on page 13, lines 9-19, which state, in part, "[t]he correlation matrix between A, the audio vector and the m-th face in the face vector is the submatrix ... The sum of all the elements of this submatrix ... is computed ... That face that has the maximum $c(m)$ is chosen as the speaking face."

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, now describes a system for determining that image in a frame associated with an audio track by determining a maximum correlation value among a plurality of correlation values wherein the

correlation values are determined as the sum of the elements in a submatrix representative of the correlation between the audio and an object element.

Busa describes a method and apparatus for performing speaker recognition from a processed audio and processed video signals. Busa discloses that for determining a speaker identity, a verification module determines the top N scores of both the audio and the video signals and “the two lists are combined by a weighted sum and the best-scoring candidate is chosen.” (see col. 8, lines 47-50).

Hence, contrary to the reason stated in the instant Office Action for rejecting claim 1, Busa fails to describe a correlation technique wherein correlation values are determined as the sum of the elements of a subset between said audio features and selected object features, as is recited in the claim.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Basu cannot be said to anticipate the present invention because Basu fails to disclose each and every element recited.

For the amendments made to the claim and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of the claim has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to claims 8 and 15, these claims recite subject matter similar to the system recited in claim 1 and were rejected for the same reason used in rejecting claim 1. Hence, the remarks made in response to the rejection of claim 1 are also applicable in response to the rejection of these claims. For the amendments made to the claims 8 and 15, which is similar to the amendment made to claim 1, and for the remarks made with regard to claim 1, which are reasserted, as if in full, herein, applicant submits that the reason for rejecting claims 8 and 15 has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

With regard the remaining claims, these claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by, and allowable over, the reference cited. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by


virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: May 2, 2005

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on May 2, 2005.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)

 5/2/05
(Signature and Date)